

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 6-10 have been amended. Claim 5 is cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 USC 103

Applicant has amended the claims to highlight the distinction over Shishkin (US 4,891,115) in view of Estes (US 5,299,359).

Claim 1 now initially recites “*a corrosion monitoring tool adapted for examining an interior surface of said pipe to determine the extent of any corrosion*”. This feature highlights the difference over Shishkin in that the claimed invention is directed at a corrosion monitoring tool that is adapted to monitor the interior surface before and after the repair.

Shishkin is concerned with a different type of repair apparatus, which automatically applies a new coating to the interior surface as it moves through the pipe. There is no monitoring to determine if and where repair is needed or of confirming the extent of such a repair.

Examiner turns to Estes for this monitoring, but Estes only teaches that the result of a corrosion measurement is that tubing about to fail is replaced (column 1 lines 22-36). There is no disclosure of how this monitoring is to be performed or even if it is to be performed in-situ by a downhole tool.

Applicant disagrees with the examiner’s assertion that it would have been obvious to have added the monitoring of Estes to ensure the repair job of Shishkin was adequate. Estes mentions replacement but not repair, let alone confirming the extent of such a repair. Thus, it cannot be obvious, since such monitoring is not even disclosed in Estes. Moreover, Shishkin’s design motivates a skilled person away from a monitoring tool of any kind. The uniform and

indiscriminate coating applied by Shishkin is likely to be considered sufficient in itself.

Monitoring would have been unnecessary, or possibly even undesirable (added complexity and/or functionality), since the repair in Shishkin was not intended to be targeted.

The claimed invention needs to be considered as a whole when assessing obviousness. Claim 1 is directed at a downhole tool capable of performing targeted downhole cleaning, repair and monitoring the extent of the targeted repair. It is the monitoring tool adapted to determine the extent of corrosion before and after the repair that provides this targeted effect. The prior art relied upon, either alone or taken together, makes no suggestion of such an apparatus.

Claim 4 has also been amended to highlight the difference of performing monitoring before and after the repair. It is submitted the present application is now in an allowable form.

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed May 5, 2008 for which the three-month date for response was August 5, 2008. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), Applicants petition for an extension of time of two months in which to respond to the Office Action. This two month extension will bring the deadline for response to October 5, 2008 which is within the six-month statutory period. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-2183 (Reference Number 68.0327).

Dated: October 6, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Jonna Flores/
Jonna Flores
Registration No.: 56,803
Schlumberger Technology Corp.
200 Gillingham Lane
Sugar Land, TX 77478
281-285-3658 (tel)
281-285-8821 (fax)